

Section M, Annex 1

M 2.c.3.1 Relevancy Evaluation Criteria

The following tables outline the criteria to be used for evaluating contract relevance.

| Relevancy Rating | Very Relevant=5 | Relevant=3 | Somewhat Relevant=1 | Not Relevant=0 |
|------------------|--|--|---|--------------------------------|
| | Provided launch facilities that supported a successful multi-stage orbital launch. The launch vehicle was successfully integrated onto the spaceport. The launches required telemetry, FTS, tracking (GPS and/or tracking radars) and off site tracking/telemetry sources integrated into the spaceport infrastructure. The contract was firm fixed price. | Provided launch facilities that supported a successful launch, either orbital or ballistic in excess of 500 km range. The launch vehicle was successfully integrated onto the spaceport and required telemetry, FTS and tracking (GPS and/or tracking radars). | Provided launch facilities that supported any launch over 100 km. The launch vehicle was successfully integrated onto the spaceport. The launch required telemetry. | No launches supported to date. |

| Relevancy Rating | Very Relevant=5 | Relevant=3 | Somewhat Relevant=1 | Not Relevant=0 |
|------------------|--|---|--|---------------------------------------|
| | <p>Provided launch operations that supported a successful multi-stage orbital launch. The launch vehicle was successfully integrated onto the spaceport. The launches required telemetry, FTS, and tracking (GPS and/or tracking radars) and off site tracking/telemetry sources integrated into the spaceport infrastructure. Engineering support included working interface with launch pad and launch control center. Stored the equivalent of 50K lbs of 1.1 ordnance. The contract was firm –fixed price.</p> | <p>Provided launch operations that supported a successful launch, either orbital or ballistic in excess of 500 km range. The launch vehicle was successfully integrated onto the spaceport and required telemetry, FTS and tracking (GPS and/or tracking radars). Engineering support included working interface with launch pad and launch control center. Stored the equivalent of 10K lbs of 1.1 ordnance.</p> | <p>Provided launch operations that supported any launch over 100 km. The launch vehicle was successfully integrated onto the spaceport. The launch required telemetry. Engineering support included working interface with launch pad and launch control center. Stored the equivalent of 200K lbs of 1.3 ordnance and 1000 lbs of 1.1 ordnance.</p> | <p>No launches supported to date.</p> |

| Relevancy Rating | Very Relevant=5 | Relevant=3 | Somewhat Relevant=1 | Not Relevant=0 |
|------------------|---|---|---|-----------------------------------|
| | <p>Provided range or integrated a government range into Spaceport operations. The range support included telemetry receiving, real-time displays, tracking (GPS or radar), FTS command destruct transmitter and ground safety. If using a Spaceport provided FTS system, it was certified by an established government range.</p> | <p>Provided range or integrated a government range into Spaceport operations. The range support included telemetry receiving and real-time displays. Launch vehicle program office provided flight and ground safety.</p> | <p>Successfully integrated a government range into the Spaceport.</p> | <p>No flight test operations.</p> |